

Countable support iterations and large continuum

Chaz Schlindwein

Division of Mathematics and Computer Science

Lander University

Greenwood, South Carolina 29649, USA

chaz@lander.edu

February 1, 2008

Abstract

We prove that any countable support iteration formed with posets with ω_2 -p.i.c. has ω_2 -c.c., assuming CH in the ground model. This improves earlier results of Shelah by removing the restriction on the length of the iteration. Thus, we solve the problem of obtaining a large continuum via such forcing iterations.

Shelah [5, chapter VIII] introduces the notion of ω_2 -p.i.c. forcing. He shows that if $\langle P_\xi : \xi \leq \kappa \rangle$ is a countable support forcing iteration based on $\langle \dot{Q}_\xi : \xi < \kappa \rangle$ such that $\dot{Q}_\xi$ has ω_2 -p.i.c. in $V[G_{P_\xi}]$ for all $\xi < \kappa$, then if CH holds in V and $\kappa \leq \omega_2$ then P_κ has ω_2 -c.c. Many familiar forcings satisfy ω_2 -p.i.c., such as the forcings to add a Sacks real, a Mathias real, a Laver real, and so forth. Also, ω_2 -p.i.c. largely subsumes ω_2 -e.c.c., as demonstrated in [1, lemma 57], [2, lemma 24], and [3, lemma 15]. In this paper we eliminate the restriction on the length of the iteration. Also, the hypothesis of our theorem is that each $\dot{Q}_\xi$ has weak ω_2 -p.i.c. and the iteration does not collapse ω_1 , where weak ω_2 -p.i.c. can be viewed as “ ω_2 -p.i.c. minus properness.”

The main idea which is required, aside from [5, chapter VIII] of course, is the notion of $\dot{P}_{\eta,\kappa}^M$ from [4]. The statement $p \Vdash_{P_\eta} “\dot{q} \in \dot{P}_{\eta,\kappa} \cap M[G_{P_\eta}]”$ means that for every $p_1 \leq p$ there is $p_2 \leq p_1$ and $q_1 \in P_\kappa$ and $x \in M$ such that x is a P_η -name and $p_2 \Vdash “\dot{q} = x = q_1 \restriction [\eta, \kappa).”$ In contrast, the statement $p \Vdash_{P_\eta} “\dot{q} \in \dot{P}_{\eta,\kappa}^M”$ means that for every $p_1 \leq p$ there is $p_2 \leq p_1$ and $q_1 \in P_\kappa \cap M$ such that $p_2 \Vdash “\dot{q} = q_1 \restriction [\eta, \kappa).”$ As always, the notation “ $q_1 \restriction [\eta, \kappa)$ ” does not refer to the check (with respect to P_η) of the restriction of q_1 to the interval $[\eta, \kappa)$, but rather to the P_η -name which is forced to be a function with domain $[\check{\eta}, \check{\kappa})$ such that for every γ in the interval $[\eta, \kappa)$ we have that $q_1 \restriction [\eta, \kappa)(\check{\gamma})$ is the P_η -name for the $\dot{P}_{\eta,\gamma}$ -name corresponding to the P_γ -name $q_1(\gamma)$ (see [1, section 3] for greater detail on this point). The notion of $p \Vdash “\dot{q} \in \dot{P}_{\eta,\kappa}^M”$ is exploited in [4] to prove preservation of semi-properness under countable support (CS) iteration, preservation of hemi-properness under CS iteration, and a theorem giving a weak but sufficient condition for a CS iteration to

add no reals. The main property of $\dot{P}_{\eta,\kappa}^M$ which is needed in [4] and in the present paper is the fact that $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\eta} “(\forall \dot{q} \in \dot{P}_{\eta,\kappa}^M)(\text{supt}(\dot{q}) \subseteq \check{M}).”$ The fact that this holds is clear from the characterization of $p \Vdash_{P_\eta} “\dot{q} \in \dot{P}_{\eta,\kappa}^M”$ given above; in any case a detailed proof is given in [4, lemma 3].

Definition 1. We say that (P, M, N, i, j) is embryonic iff for some sufficiently large regular λ we have that M and N are countable elementary substructures of H_λ and $\omega_1 < i < j < \omega_2$ and $\text{cf}(i) = \text{cf}(j) = \omega_1$ and $P \in M \cap N$ and $i \in M$ and $j \in N$ and $\text{sup}(\omega_2 \cap M) < j$ and $i \cap M = j \cap N$.

Definition 2. We say that (P, M, N, i, j, h) is passable iff for some sufficiently large regular cardinal λ we have that (P, M, N, i, j) is embryonic and h is an isomorphism from M onto N and h is the identity on $M \cap N$ and $h(i) = j$.

Definition 3. We say that P has weak ω_2 -p.i.c. iff whenever (P, M, N, i, j, h) is passable and $p \in P \cap M$ then there is some $q \leq p$ such that $q \leq h(p)$.

Definition 4. Suppose $\langle P_\xi : \xi \leq \kappa \rangle$ is a countable support iteration. We say that $(P_\kappa, M, N, i, j, \eta, h, p)$ is strictly passable iff (P_κ, M, N, i, j) is embryonic and $\eta \in \kappa \cap M \cap N$ and $p \in P_\eta$ and $p \Vdash “h$ is an isomorphism from $M[G_{P_\eta}]$ onto $N[G_{P_\eta}]$ and the restriction of h to $M[G_{P_\eta}] \cap N[G_{P_\eta}]$ is the identity and $h(i) = j$ and $\check{N}$ is the image of $\check{M}$ under $h.”$

Definition 5. We say P_κ is strictly weak ω_2 -p.i.c. iff whenever $(P_\kappa, M, N, i, j, \eta, h, p)$ is strictly passable and $p \Vdash_{P_\eta} “\dot{q} \in \dot{P}_{\eta,\kappa}^M”$ then there is $r \in P_\kappa$ such that $r \restriction \eta = p$ and $p \Vdash “r \restriction [\eta, \kappa] \leq \dot{q}$ and $r \restriction [\eta, \kappa] \leq h(\dot{q}).”$

Lemma 6. Suppose $\langle P_\xi : \xi \leq \kappa \rangle$ is a countable support iteration based on $\langle \dot{Q}_\xi : \xi < \kappa \rangle$ and P_ξ is strictly weak ω_2 -p.i.c. whenever $\xi < \kappa$. Suppose that if $\kappa = \gamma + 1$ then $\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{P_\gamma}$ “ $\dot{Q}_\gamma$ has weak ω_2 -p.i.c. and $\omega_1^V = \omega_1^{V[G_{P_\gamma}]}$.” Then P_κ is strictly weak ω_2 -p.i.c.

Proof: Suppose $(P_\kappa, M, N, i, j, \eta, h, p)$ is strictly passable and $p \Vdash$ “ $\dot{q} \in \dot{P}_{\eta, \kappa}^M$.”

Case 1: $\kappa = \gamma + 1$.

We have that $(P_\gamma, M, N, i, j, \eta, h, p)$ is strictly passable, so we may take $r_0 \in P_\gamma$ such that $r_0 \restriction \eta = p$ and $p \Vdash$ “ $r_0 \restriction [\eta, \gamma) \leq \dot{q} \restriction \gamma$ and $r_0 \restriction [\eta, \gamma) \leq h(\dot{q} \restriction \gamma)$.” Now, the restriction of h to $M[G_{P_\eta}]^{\dot{P}_{\eta, \gamma}}$, which by notational convention is the set of all $\dot{P}_{\eta, \gamma}$ -names in $M[G_{P_\eta}]$, induces an isomorphism $h^* \in V[G_{P_\gamma}]$ from $M[G_{P_\gamma}]$ onto $N[G_{P_\gamma}]$ such that $h^*(i) = j$ and the restriction of h^* to $M[G_{P_\gamma}] \cap N[G_{P_\gamma}]$ is the identity and $\check{N}$ is the image of $\check{M}$. Hence we may use the fact that $\dot{Q}_\gamma$ has weak ω_2 -p.i.c. to take $\dot{r}_1 \in \dot{Q}_\gamma$ such that $r_0 \Vdash$ “ $\dot{r}_1 \leq \dot{q}(\gamma)$ and $\dot{r}_1 \leq h^*(\dot{q}(\gamma))$.” Then let $r = (r_0, \dot{r}_1) \in P_\kappa$. We have that r is as required.

Case 2: κ is a limit ordinal.

Let $\alpha = \sup(\kappa \cap M \cap N)$ and take $\langle \alpha_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ an increasing sequence of ordinals from $\alpha \cap M \cap N$ cofinal in α such that $\alpha_0 = \eta$. Build $\langle p_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ such that $p_0 = p$ and for every $n \in \omega$ we have $p_{n+1} \restriction \alpha_n = p_n$ and $p_n \Vdash$ “ $p_{n+1} \restriction [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}) \leq \dot{q} \restriction [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1})$ and $p_{n+1} \restriction [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}) \leq h_n^*(\dot{q} \restriction [\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}))$ ” where h_n^* is the isomorphism from $M[G_{P_{\alpha_n}}]$ onto $N[G_{P_{\alpha_n}}]$ induced by h as in the successor case above. This is possible by the induction hypothesis and [4, lemma 5]. Take $r \in P_\kappa$ such that $r \restriction \alpha_n = p_n$ for every $n \in \omega$, and

$r(\xi) = \dot{q}(\xi)$ for all $\xi \in \kappa \cap M$ such that $\alpha \leq \xi$, and $r(\xi) = h(\dot{q})(\xi)$ for all $\xi \in \kappa \cap N$ such that $\alpha \leq \xi$, and $r(\xi) = \mathbf{1}_{\dot{Q}_\xi}$ in all other cases. Then r is as required. As noted earlier, the main point is that $p \Vdash \text{“supt}(\dot{q}) \subseteq \check{M} \text{.”}$

We repeat [5, VIII.2.3] (see also [1, lemma 42] but note by the way that the proof of [1, lemma 43] is incorrect; the present paper is in part a repair of this deficiency).

Lemma 7. *Suppose CH holds and P has weak ω_2 -p.i.c. Then P has ω_2 -c.c.*

Proof: Take λ a sufficiently large regular cardinal. Given $\langle p_i : \text{cf}(i) = \omega_1$ and $i < \omega_2 \rangle$ (potentially, a counterexample to ω_2 -p.i.c.), take for each such i a countable elementary submodel N_i of H_λ such that $\{p_i, i, P\} \subseteq N_i$. It suffices to show that there are $\eta < \xi < \omega_2$ and h such that $\eta \cap N_\eta = \xi \cap N_\xi$ and $\sup(\omega_2 \cap N_\eta) < \xi$ and h is an isomorphism from N_η onto N_ξ and $h(\eta) = \xi$ and the restriction of h to $N_\eta \cap N_\xi$ is the identity. Take $f(i) = \sup(i \cap N_i)$ for all $i < \omega_2$ such that $\text{cf}(i) = \omega_1$. Take $S_0 \subseteq \{i < \omega_2 : \text{cf}(i) = \omega_1\}$ stationary and $\gamma < \omega_2$ such that $(\forall i \in S_0)(f(i) = \gamma)$. By CH we may take $S_1 \subseteq S_0$ such that $|S_1| = \aleph_2$ and whenever $i < j$ are both in S_1 then $i \cap N_i = j \cap N_j$. Take $S_2 \subseteq S_1$ of size $\aleph_2$ such that whenever $i < j$ are both in S_2 then $\sup(\omega_2 \cap N_i) < j$. By Δ -system, take $S_3 \subseteq S_2$ of size $\aleph_2$ and a countable N such that whenever i and j are distinct elements of S_3 then $N_i \cap N_j = N$. Fix an enumeration $\langle c_k : k \in \omega \rangle$ of N . Let $N_i^+ = \langle N_i; \in, i, c_0, c_1, \dots \rangle$. Up to isomorphism there are only $\aleph_1$ -many possible N_i^+ , so the lemma is established.

Thus we have proved the following:

Theorem 8. *Suppose $\langle P_\xi : \xi \leq \kappa \rangle$ is a countable support iteration based*

on $\langle \dot{Q}_\xi : \xi < \kappa \rangle$ and for each $\xi < \kappa$ we have that $\dot{Q}_\xi$ has weak ω_2 -p.i.c. in $V[G_{P_\xi}]$. Suppose also that $\omega_1^V = \omega_1^{V[G_{P_\kappa}]}$ and that CH holds in V . Then P_κ has ω_2 -c.c.

We also have the following:

Fact 9. *Suppose $\langle P_\xi : \xi \leq \kappa \rangle$ is a countable support forcing iteration. Then no reals are added at limit stages of uncountable cofinality.*

Proof: Suppose $\alpha \leq \kappa$ and $\text{cf}(\alpha) > \omega$ and $q \Vdash_{P_\alpha} \text{“}\dot{r} \in {}^\omega\omega\text{”}$. Take M a countable model containing all relevant data. Let $\beta = \sup(\alpha \cap M)$ and let $\langle \beta_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ be an increasing sequence of ordinals from $\beta \cap M$ cofinal in β with $\beta_0 = 0$. Build $\langle p_n, q_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ such that $q = q_0$ and $p_n \Vdash_{P_{\beta_n}} \text{“}q_n \in \dot{P}_{\beta_n, \alpha}^M$ and $q_n \leq q_{n-1} \restriction [\beta_n, \alpha)$ and q_n decides the value of $r(n-1)$ ” and $p_{n+1} \restriction \beta_n = p_n$ and $p_n \Vdash \text{“}p_{n+1} \restriction [\beta_n, \beta_{n+1}) \leq q_n \restriction \beta_{n+1}\text{”}$. Then take $q' \in P_\alpha$ such that $\text{supt}(q') \subseteq \beta$ and $q' \restriction \beta_n = p_n$ for all $n \in \omega$. We have that $q' \leq q$ and $q' \restriction \beta \Vdash \text{“}\mathbf{1} \Vdash_{\dot{P}_{\beta, \alpha}} \text{“}r = \dot{s}\text{”}$ for some $s \in V[G_{P_\beta}]$.

Fact 10. *The ${}^\omega\omega$ -bounding property, the Sacks property, the Laver property, etc., are preserved by countable support iteration (without the assumption of properness).*

This follows from Fact 9, together with the arguments of [5, section VI.2]; the only place [5] uses the properness assumption is to handle the uncountable cofinality case.

References

- [1] Schlindwein, C., “Consistency of Suslin’s hypothesis, a non-special Aronszajn tree, and GCH,” *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, vol. **59**, pp. 1–29, 1994
- [2] Schlindwein, C., “Suslin’s hypothesis does not imply stationary antichains,” *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, vol. **64**, pp. 153–167, 1993
- [3] Schlindwein, C., “Countably paracompact Aronszajn trees and CH.”
- [4] Schlindwein, C., “Preservation theorems for countable support forcing iterations.”
- [5] Shelah, S., *Proper Forcing*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **940**, Springer-Verlag, 1982